

Remarks

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

-Rejection of Claims 79-102 as lacking written description

The examiner rejected claims 79-102 as indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant disagrees with the rejection. Nevertheless, claims 79-102 have been canceled, without prejudice, in order to bring prosecution to a conclusion.

-Rejection of Claims 16-28, 30-32, 35, 37, 68-78, and 109-113

a. The examiner has not established that the claims are indefinite

The examiner rejected claims 16-28, 30-32, 35, 37, 68-78, and 109-113 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for the reasons set forth in the previous office action. In that office action (p. 2), the examiner argued that it was unclear what constitutes "an amount and under conditions effective to form a dispersion" and "...under conditions of operation of said equipment."

The pending claims do not include either of the foregoing limitations. Applicant does not acquiesce in the rejections with respect to the claims that have been canceled, without prejudice.

b. Rejection of claims 109, 110, 112, and 113 as not complying with 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(b)

The examiner rejected claims 109, 110, 112, and 113 on the grounds that these claims do not include differing positive, manipulative method steps.

Claims 110, 111, and 113 have been amended to recite the positive limitation of "providing as said dispersant" the different N,N-disubstituted amides. The amendment does not

narrow the claims, and is believed to overcome the examiner's concern. Claims 109-113 clearly differ in scope. This difference is clear from the fact that a reference describing the use of a given N,N-disubstituted amide could invalidate claim 109 without necessarily invalidating 110-113.

Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

c-e. Rejection of claims 79, 80, 81, and 82

The examiner rejected claims 79-82 on various grounds. Claims 79-82 have been canceled.


Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The examiner rejected claims 79-108 as obvious over Hollis (S.African ZA 6805343) or Fern (4,410,419) in view of Devicaris (5,243,063). Claims 79-108 have been canceled.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the attached amendments and allowance of the pending claims. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees in connection with this paper, or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-0429 maintained by Baker Hughes Incorporated.

Respectfully submitted,


Paula D. Morris
Registration No. 31,516
Paula D. Morris & Associates, P.C.
d/b/a The Morris Law Firm, P.C.
10260 Westheimer, Suite 360
Houston, TX 77042

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.